

REMARKS

In the above referenced case, claims 176-182, 185-196, 199-211, 214-224 and 227-232 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. Objections to the Claims

Claims 179, 193, 208, and 221 were objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claims 185, 199, 214, and 227, respectively. Claims 179, 193, 208, and 221 have been canceled. Therefore, the objections with respect to these claims are now moot.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 176, 178-179, 181-182, 185, 187-189, 190, 192-193, 195-196, 199, 201-205, 207-208, 210-211, 214, 216-218, 220-221, 223-224, 227 and 229-232 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,042,921 ("SATO") in view of Atarashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,172,254 ("ATARASHI").

Independent claims 176, 190, 205, and 217 have been amended further include an additional element (i.e., element [h]) of projecting (or means for projecting) the third single collinear beam of electromagnetic energy (or light) onto a projection screen, which projected beam is viewable as a three-dimensional image (e.g., with 3-D viewing glasses). The amended element has support based on at least Figures 19-21 and their corresponding text in the Specification.¹

Both SATO and ATARASHI disclose a system for projecting two-dimensional images.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims should be in condition for allowance.

¹ Of course, the embodiments described in the Specification (or illustrated in the Figures) are merely exemplary. Therefore, the scope of the claim should not be construed to cover only the exemplary embodiments described (or illustrated).

III. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections Regarding Dependent Claims

Claims 177, 191, 206, and 219 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over SATO in view of ATARASHI and further in view of Kurematsu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,237,435. Based on the foregoing regarding independent claims 176, 190, 205, and 217, Applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections of the dependent claims are now moot and these claims are in condition for allowance.

IV. Other Claim Amendments

Claims 185-188, 199-202, 214-216, 218, and 227-230 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP
P.O. Box 400
Los Altos, CA 94023
(650) 948-0822